

Hello fellow Tribal members:

The following statements are true, and documented by the minutes from the General Council held on Saturday April 19, 2010, and the minutes from the Executive Committee meeting held on April 21, 2010.

It is my wish that all Tribal members are informed of the actions made by their elected officials.

At the Executive Committee meeting held on April 21, 2010 in the A.S.T. court room I, Governor George Blanchard presented a resolution implementing the General Council vote to dissolve TEC Inc. Lt. Governor Dan LittleAxe and I stated we saw the vote as a mandate from the voting shareholders (Tribal members), and the Executive Committee was obligated to pass the resolution in order to carry out the will of the voting Tribal members. Based on the arguments from Legal Advocates for Indian Country attorneys Whitney Weingartner and Alyssa Campbell (these attorneys are supposed to represent the Tribe), Secretary Michelle Lopez, Treasurer Anita Chisholm, and Representative Alecia Onzahwah voted to disregard the will of the people, and voted against the resolution. Several Tribal members, as well as myself and Dan LittleAxe noted that it is a conflict of interest for Executive Committee members to sit on the Executive Committee and the TEC board at the same time, and also a conflict of interest for Legal Advocates for Indian Country to represent both the Executive Committee and the TEC board simultaneously when the parties had opposing stances on an issue. The attorneys stated their opinion is that it is not a conflict of interest because when the Executive Committee members sit on the TEC board, they are not acting as Executive Committee members, and vice versa. It is my, and Dan LittleAxe's opinion that as elected officials they are Executive Committee members 100% of the time, and cannot make unbiased decisions while sitting on both boards simultaneously. It is also our opinion that the same law firm cannot make unbiased decisions while representing opposing sides of an issue. It should be noted that during the entire debate, neither of the attorneys (who are being paid by the Tribe) showed any inclination to present the Tribe's contention that the General Council's vote was valid and constitutionally binding. The TEC board was admirably represented, but the Tribe was not represented at all.

1. Are the people who attend the bi-annual General Council represented by the Executive Committee?
2. When a motion is made and seconded and voted upon, is the elected body obligated by mandate to oblige the voters?
3. If not, why spend money on expenses of feeding, and also paying Department Heads to attend the General Council, if all the General Council can do is make SUGGESTIONS to the elected body?
4. If the elected body is going to disregard any decision made by the General Council that they don't like, why should the Tribal members take time from their schedules to attend General Council meetings to make these decisions?

Respectfully,


George Blanchard, Governor of the
Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma